

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current
scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

SUGAR REPORTS

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE
SUGAR DIVISION

WASHINGTON, D. C.

NOVEMBER 1960

NO. 103

<u>CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGES</u>
1. MARKET REVIEW	2 - 3
2. NEW SUGAR BOWLS -- Address by Lawrence Myers, Director, Sugar Division, November 15, 1960	4 - 13
3. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS	14 - 15
4. STATISTICAL SERIES	16 - 26
(a) Highlights	16
(b) Supply and Disposition Summary: January-September 1960	17
(c) Disposition and stocks: January-October 1960 and 1959	18
(d) Mainland Production and Quota Charges: January-September 1960 and 1959	19
(e) Refiners and Importers receipts by Source of Supply: January-September 1960 and 1959	19
(f) Quota and Quota Charges: to November 10, 1960 to end October 1960 and 1959	20 - 21 22
(g) Deliveries by States: September 1960 to end September 1960 and 1959	23 24 - 25
(h) Sugar Prices by Areas	26
(i) Refined sugar production and stocks	26

MARKET REVIEW

During October and early November the sugar market appeared colorless but a highly dramatic shift occurred in the competition between cane sugar refiners and beet sugar processors. Deliveries of sugar by refiners in October were 68,000 tons or about 15 percent larger than a year ago and only about 10 percent smaller than in September. This made refinery deliveries for the year through October about 130,000 tons larger than a year ago. Meanwhile beet sugar deliveries in October fell to only two-thirds those of September and were the smallest for any October since 1955 when the beet industry was geared to an annual quota of only 1,800,000 tons. In early November deliveries compared with a year earlier continued to grow for refiners but hardly held even for beet processors.

By the end of October beet sugar deliveries in 1960 were only about 48,000 tons larger than in 1959. Importers' deliveries of quota sugar were smaller by 55,000 tons. All deliveries for quota purposes, January-October 1960 totaled 7,855,992 tons and were about 128,000 tons larger than for the corresponding 1959 period. With this total, deliveries were very close to the longtime seasonally adjusted trend depicted in the article in Sugar Reports 101.

Changes in wholesale list prices for refined sugar were limited to the Chicago-West and Southwest Territories for which 0.15 cent per pound reductions were announced in late November. Earlier a competitive allowance of 0.15 cent had been announced for the direct shipment allowance territory (Chicago-St. Louis). The usual 0.10 cent direct shipment allowance applies to the new quotations in that territory. Also, the effective selling price in the Gulf territory is said to be 9.30 cents rather than the 9.50 list.

Wholesale refined price quotations as of November 23, 1960 appeared as follows:

Wholesale refined price quotations as of November 23, 1960

	<u>Cane</u> cents per	<u>Beet</u> pound
Northeast	9.70	9.10 (West NY & Pa. only)
Southeast	9.60	
Gulf	9.50 (less 0.20)	
Chicago-West	9.00	8.80
Southwest	9.00	8.80
Oregon-Wash.	8.80	8.80
Bal. -Intermountain-NW	8.90	8.90
Calif. -Arizona-Nevada	8.95	8.95

The spot price for raw sugar, duty paid, New York (new quotation) was 6.50 cents per pound on November 22, 1960. The quotations had been 6.48 cents on November 18 and 21 with 6.55 cents prevailing earlier. The comparable average for October had been 6.52 cents with the range in daily quotations 6.45 to 6.55 cents. For the year through November 18 the average was 6.24 cents.

The New York spot price quotation for world sugar continues nominally at 3.25 cents per pound, f.a.s. Cuba. The trade reports offerings and actual sales are far below this figure. Sellers seem anxious for business and bid lustily on any tender. Recently Casablanca postponed a tender for 36,000 tons of raws despite offerings reported at prices as low as 2.80 cents per pound. There is little interest in Cuban sugar and almost all sales reported are for sugar of other origins.

The world market situation for 1961 will be the subject of the International Sugar Council meeting in Mexico City beginning November 28. The Statistical Committee of the Council will begin its deliberations on November 23 to estimate for the year 1961 requirements for sugar from the world free market and the supplies available to meet these needs. The committee has been making such estimates as a basis for establishing quotas in effect under the agreement for each year since 1954.

NEW SUGAR BOWLS

An address by Lawrence Myers, Director, Sugar Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, before the Cuban Chamber of Commerce in the United States in New York City, Tuesday, November 15, 1960

Mr. Chairman, Members and Guests of the Cuban Chamber of Commerce in the United States:

It was indeed an honor for me to receive an invitation through my friend Daniel Dyer to address this luncheon meeting. It is a pleasure to be with you and to partake of your food and sociability.

Unfortunately the subject matter of this discussion is a serious, somber one. One of this country's closest and most respected friends has left our neighborly circle. Its present leaders have decided to join the Communist orbit and are repaying with calumny and hate the admiration and affection our country has always shown to Cuba. One accepts a grave responsibility in undertaking at this juncture to speak on the subject of Cuba and our sugar supply.

No purpose would be served in debating whether or not anything might have been done to prevent recent developments in Cuba. Moreover, it is not possible to lay down a formula that will assure success in bringing the Cuban story to a happy ending. The cold fact is that much will depend upon how much money and aid sources outside of Cuba are prepared to spend in fostering Communism in that area.

Our major concern today is with the effects of the Cuban developments on our own sugar supply program. However, the Cuban developments have contained so many paradoxes and have contradicted so many of our established beliefs and assumptions that I think it is worth while to note a few of these as a means of understanding the problem and perhaps of forestalling fallacious remedies.

First, I think most of us have assumed that friendship begets friendship among nations as well as among individuals. On this basis what country could be closer to us than Cuba? Can anyone forget that one of our most popular Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt, won much of his early fame because of his part in the charge up San Juan Hill?

As a matter of fact the very existence of the Cuban Chamber of Commerce in the United States and its work over the years emphasize the close ties of friendship and business that have prevailed.

In the international sugar field our Government and the United States sugar industry have consistently supported Cuba. As the United States Delegate at a number of international negotiations on sugar this has given me a great deal of personal satisfaction. This country was able over the years to give Cuba such support on international sugar matters because of the outstanding leaders the Cuban sugar industry developed and because of the sound policies they expounded.

The United States support of Cuban positions in international sugar meetings has always brought into sharp focus the contrast between this country's relationship with small neighboring nations and the Soviet's relations with its small neighbors. Delegates from the Soviet satellites, for instance, seldom dare express an opinion until the Soviet Delegate has acted; then like so many automatons they reiterate the Soviet position.

In our trade relations with Cuba we have been more than friendly. To understand the closeness of our trade ties one must go back to the Treaty of Reciprocity between the two countries negotiated in 1902 and ratified by them both in 1903. Under this treaty the United States agreed that products of Cuba could be imported into this country at tariff rates 20 percent below those applicable to most favored nations and Cuba agreed that products of the United States could be imported into Cuba at tariff rates 20 percent below the Cuban rates applicable to most favored nations.

The tariff preferentials as provided in the 1903 and subsequent agreements gave a great impetus to trade between the two countries. United States imports from Cuba rose from approximately \$40 million annually before the agreement to approximately one-half billion dollars annually in the last pre-Castro years. Likewise, United States exports to Cuba rose from \$26 million annually to an average of \$580 million for 1957 and 1958.

Recently Cuban leaders have complained about Cuba's adverse balance of trade with the United States during much of the post-war period. It is an absurdity, of course, to talk about bilateral trade balances in a world that has been organizing itself toward multilateral trading systems since World War II. In the interests of simple intellectual integ-

rity, however, one might suppose that our critics would be willing to call attention to the additional quantities of sugar Cuba has been able to sell in the world market because our Government has either financed the purchase directly from Cuba or financed the purchase of other sugars so that Cuba could fill the gap in the world market.

If the critics were to start dealing with all the facts truthfully and objectively they would have to admit that the rising level of imports that caused Cuba's unfavorable balance of trade with the United States during the post-war period reflected the growing Cuban prosperity and the degree to which Cuba was forging ahead in its industry and standard of living. It is a fit challenge to the present Cuban leadership to continue the past rate of progress.

The 20 percent tariff preferential gave Cuba a virtual monopoly in supplying the sugar import requirements of the United States market. (Parenthetically, let me remind you that until 1946 the Philippines were a part of the United States.) The tariff advantage enjoyed by Cuban sugar became most pronounced under the Tariff Act of 1930 when the most favored nation rate was established at 2.50 cents per pound. This resulted in a rate of 2.00 cents per pound on Cuban sugar. Naturally, Cuban sugar virtually kept other foreign sugar out of our market and the tariff rate on Cuban sugar was the effective rate.

Historically, our imports of Cuban sugar rose from approximately one-half million tons in 1902 to an average of 3-1/2 million tons during the decade of the 1920's. Imports fell to a low point of 1-1/2 million tons in 1933 after which they recovered, largely under the impetus of our war time requirements and our post-war sugar programs. In 1958 we again imported 3-1/2 million tons of sugar from Cuba. Our sugar imports in 1902 yielded Cuba \$18 million; in 1958 they yielded Cuba \$381 million.

Yet another paradox is involved in the Cuban developments. On a per capita basis, Cuba's imports from the United States and its exports to the United States both ranked third among all the nations with which the United States trades. Among all the countries of Latin America, Cuba's per capita income ranked fourth. The relative size of its medical staff, its percentage of literacy, its consumption of electricity, its highway system all demonstrate that Cuba was a relatively prosperous and rapidly developing country.

In considering how to reestablish constructive relationships with Cuba we must keep in mind that our proffers of continued friendship and generous trade programs have both been rejected.

Since Cuba's leadership has chosen to go down the Communist path it is worth while to note some of the alternatives that may confront it. As I have observed, our imports from Cuba have amounted to a half billion dollars annually. This country has discontinued its imports of Cuban sugar which accounted for \$350 million or more annually. It has not stopped taking other Cuban products of which our imports have amounted to around \$150 million a year. If the Communist countries are prepared to pour a half billion dollars a year into Cuba and to supply the necessary implements of production and other requirements they presumably can keep Cuba going without any trade with the United States and without offsetting increases in trade with other "free world" countries. If the Communist countries want to improve conditions in Cuba they will have to supply more than a half billion dollars per year. If they supply less, Cuban living standards will fall and the Cuban people will suffer. On such decisions rest the welfare of the Cuban people and the future of our sugar trade with Cuba.

Now let us turn specifically to our special sugar legislation and its purpose and benefits to Cuba. To understand the nature of our sugar legislation it is necessary to transport oneself back to the 1920's. World War I had cut European production of beet sugar and recovery did not come quickly, so world sugar supplies remained short for several years. The sugar price explosion referred to as the "Dance of the Millions" lasted for only a few months in 1920. Nevertheless, world sugar prices remained comparatively strong for several years. The world price started to decline in 1925 and hit bottom when it reached one-half cent per pound in 1932.

Although the world depression was a major factor in the last headlong plunge of prices, it is clear that the period of high prices prior to 1925 had stimulated world production and that overproduction in turn was taking its toll.

In an effort to protect our own producers from being injured by low world prices Congress raised the most favored nation (or full duty) tariff rate to 2-1/2 cents per pound in the Tariff Act of 1930, an increase of nearly 3/10 of a cent per pound. However, this increase in the tariff rate was small in comparison with the decline in world prices.

Moreover, the upward trend in sugar production in our domestic areas continued. As a result our domestic producers suffered from low prices and Cuban producers suffered from both low prices and low exports to the United States.

When it came time to write a sugar program in the early 1930's there was a decision against a further increase in the tariff that would benefit the domestic industry at the expense of Cuba. Since this is a point about which there has been a good deal of misunderstanding and some plain double talk, I think it is time to set the record straight.

It has been said that the quota system was adopted because a further increase in the tariff would have been ineffective. Let us look at the facts. Even at the low point of 1933 sugar imports amounted to over 20 percent of domestic consumption. The world price at its low point of one-half cent per pound in 1932 could not have gone much lower. As a matter of fact the world price recovered somewhat even before our new sugar program was developed. It is absurd, therefore, to say that our tariff could not have been raised sufficiently to benefit domestic producers, at least temporarily. Tariff increases would have become ineffective only as we approached self-sufficiency. At that point, also, increases in our tariff rates would fail to do further harm to Cuba.

The facts make it crystal clear that our complicated domestic sugar program with its system of quota controls was developed in major part because the United States Government wanted a sugar program that would benefit Cuban producers as well as those in the United States. A far simpler program would have been effective in aiding the domestic sugar industry if this country had not been concerned with its effects on the Cuban economy.

Let me sketch the pertinent features of our sugar program. Today farmers in the United States receive benefits on their production of sugar crops from three sources -- the tariff, the Sugar Act payments and the quota system.

The Sugar Act payments need not concern us here since they are not made to foreign producers. However, the amount of these payments is more than equalled by the revenues from an excise tax of 50 cents per 100 pounds on all sugar consumed in the United States. The payments have the twofold advantage of adding an important increment to the incomes of domestic producers and of enforcing compliance with the program.

Simultaneously with the inception of the new sugar program in 1934 the tariff was reduced one-half cent per pound to offset the levying of the processing tax of one-half cent per pound. As a result, domestic consumers did not have to bear the burden of higher total taxes on sugar. In all, the tariff rates have been reduced by 75 percent since the Sugar Act has been in effect. The most favored nation rate has been reduced from 2.50 cents to 0.625 cent per pound and the Cuban rate has been reduced from 2.00 cents to 0.50 cent per pound.

The third element in our sugar protective system is the quota premiums. Before undertaking to discuss the trend and effect of the quota premiums, let us observe what they are. They are price premiums, over and above world prices that sellers receive for sugar sold under quotas for consumption in the United States. They result from the fact that quotas regulate supplies in this country and keep out world surpluses. The quota premiums can be illustrated in terms of 1959 prices. For the calendar year 1959, the New York duty paid price of spot raw sugar averaged 6.24 cents per pound. By deducting the tariff of .50 cent per pound we get an ex-duty price of 5.74 cents. For 1959 the cost of ocean freight and insurance on shipping sugar from Cuba to New York averaged 0.39 cent per pound. Deducting this gives us an average f.a.s. Cuban price of 5.35 cents per pound. The f.a.s. Cuban price of sugar sold for export to the world market in 1959 averaged 2.97 cents per pound. The difference between the price of 5.35 cents which Cuba received on sugar sold for consumption in the United States and the price of 2.97 cents per pound which Cuba received for sugar sold in the world market constitutes the quota premium of 2.38 cents per pound. This is the premium that Cuba and our other suppliers received over and above the world price as a result of the quota system provided for by our sugar legislation.

The cuts in our tariff rates and the substitution of quota protection for sugar permitted Cuba to share in the major element of protection given to our domestic sugar industry.

I should like at this point to deal with some fallacious criticisms that have been made about our sugar quota program. First, our sugar quota program, which was enacted in 1934, is sometimes confused with our Treaty of Reciprocity of 1902 which provided for a mutual 20 percent tariff preference. Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Program started in 1934 additional advantages were given Cuba. Obviously these reciprocity arrangements are entirely separate from the benefits given Cuba under the sugar program.

Criticisms have also been made at times because our import quotas are determined unilaterally by the Congress of the United States rather than bilaterally with the Cuban Government. Clearly, our Government cannot turn over to foreign governments the control over our sugar supplies and imports.

Next, it has been charged that the United States cut the quotas for imports from Cuba in the amendments to the Sugar Act adopted in 1956. The facts are as follows:

Under the early legislation the various domestic and foreign suppliers were given percentage quotas. Under the Sugar Act of 1937 Cuba supplied 28.6 percent of our requirements.

In view of Cuba's cooperation in supplying sugar during the war and early post-war period our sugar legislation was rewritten in 1947 to protect Cuba from a post-war slump. Fixed tonnage quotas were established on all of the domestic areas and the Republic of the Philippines. Cuba was authorized to supply 95 percent of all Philippine deficits and 98.64 percent of all increases in our requirements. In the amendments adopted in 1951 this participation in growth was maintained at the high level of 96 percent.

In the amendments adopted in 1956 each supplying area, except the Philippines, was permitted to benefit from the growth in the United States market. In this revision Cuba's participation in our growth was cut from 96 percent to 29.59 percent. (This was still approximately one percent above its pre-war participation of 28.6 percent.) The important feature, however, is that Cuba was permitted to retain its previous high participation in our requirements up to 8,350,000 tons. The advantages gained by other supplying areas applied only to that part of our requirements which is in excess of 8,350,000 tons. The fact is, therefore, that the United States meticulously protected Cuba's position in this market and assured her a share in our future growth. The proof of the pudding is that our takings of Cuban sugar increased nearly 600,000 tons from 1955 to 1958. I trust that answers that.

As a means of understanding the purpose and intent of the quota program, let us see how it operated in 1935, the first full year it was in effect. In 1935 the United States imported approximately 1,830,000 tons of Cuban sugar. For that sugar the Cuban sellers received the equivalent of the world price, which was 0.88 cent per pound plus the 1935

quota premium of 1.33 cents per pound or a total price of 2.21 cents per pound. As a result Cuban sellers received close to \$81 million from the sale of sugar to the United States in 1935. Of this a little over \$32 million represented the world value of the sugar and nearly \$49 million resulted from the quota premium. I think we will all agree that a world price of less than 1.00 cent per pound was too low to provide a fair standard of living for Cuban producers. Also, the total price of 2.21 cents per pound, including the quota premium, was reasonable from the standpoint of the American consumers.

Now let us see how the program worked in 1959 and 1960 prior to the time imports from Cuba were stopped. During 1959 this country imported over 3,200,000 tons of Cuban sugar and during 1960 it imported more than 2,400,000 tons. For the period January 1959 through July 1960 the world price averaged 3.00 cents per pound, f.a.s. Cuba, and the quota premium averaged 2.29 cents per pound. From its 1959 sales of sugar to the United States Cuba received approximately \$350 million of which \$150 million represented the quota premium. From its 1960 sales to this country Cuba received about \$250 million of which \$100 million represented the quota premium.

The \$350 million which Cuba received from its sales of sugar to the United States in 1959 is a far cry from the \$81 million it received from such sales in 1935. The United States paid Cuba \$600 million for sugar in 1959 and 1960. This included premiums of \$250 million above the world market value of the sugar. Surely that was a generous subsidization of the Cuban Government.

No doubt there was justification for undertaking the sugar quota program in 1934 when the world price was below 1.00 cent per pound; today the world price is over 3.00 cents per pound. At the outset of the program quota premiums were modest; today the premium alone exceeds the total returns foreign producers received per pound of sugar, including the quota premium, in the early days of the program. In 1935 Cuba received quota premiums totalling \$49 million. The full duty countries received only negligible amounts. In 1959 Cuba received \$150 million in quota premiums and other foreign countries, including the Philippines, received over \$50 million in quota premiums. These huge amounts need to be looked at not merely from the standpoint of the foreign recipients but also from the standpoint of the American consumer.

Certainly there is ample evidence that the sugar needs of the United States would rank low in the concern of the present Cuban Government. As a matter of fact, newspapers report that a leader of the Cuban Government is now in Communist countries undertaking to work out a sales program for substantially the entire Cuban sugar crop. Moreover, Communistic programs in agriculture have tended to be less productive than capitalistic programs. In addition, a Cuban spokesman has emphasized that Cuba in the future will carry over sugar only to the extent required for the world market, thus putting this country on notice that Cuba will not undertake to protect the requirements of the United States. For the time being at least Cuba is not in a position to offer this country assurances of adequate and timely supplies at stabilized prices. Therefore there no longer seems to be the same basis for continuing to pay her the quota premiums we have in the past.

On July 6, 1960, President Eisenhower approved new amendments to the Sugar Act and pursuant thereto established the 1960 quota for Cuba at a level of 2,419,655 tons, 700,000 tons below the level previously in effect. Through a series of actions, total quotas were increased from 9,400,000 to 10,400,000 tons, and 1,200,000 tons of sugar were reallocated from Cuba to other foreign suppliers. In the case of the Dominican Republic the 322,000 tons so reallocated were purchased at substantially the world price through the mechanism of a fee of 2 cents per pound required to be paid before importation is authorized. In all other cases the new foreign suppliers received the full quota premium.

Now let us look at the facts that may have an important bearing on our future takings of Cuban sugar. Present sugar legislation extends only through March 31, 1961. Since it will be quite impossible for the new Congress to organize and pass basically new legislation in time to enable this country to obtain its requirements at the beginning of the second quarter of 1961, it seems obvious that some type of extension of the present legislation will be necessary to give Congress time in which to act.

In the writing of new legislation one of the first problems Congress will have to face is that so long as Cuba remains in the Communist orbit it will be an undependable source of supply for the United States. Presumably, however, the Congress will wish to leave the door open for some resumption of trade in the event Cuba should again become free and friendly.

A more baffling problem that Congress will face will be how to deal with the requests of all the other suppliers who want to sell sugar at premium prices in the United States.

Without attempting to be exact, it appears probable that requests for new and additional quotas to replace supplies from Cuba will total around 4 million to 5 million tons annually. This is well in excess of the Cuban quotas of recent years.

In undertaking to reduce the huge quota requests to the available market outlet it may become necessary for Congress to consider the ability of the proposed supplier to service and protect the needs of the United States market. While Cuba was our ever-available "sugar bowl," the dependability of supplies from other areas was of little importance. With Cuba no longer performing that function the assurance that supplies will reach our refiners as they are needed from other areas becomes vitally important.

When Congress amended the Sugar Act last summer to permit the reduction and reassignment of the Cuban quota, it took the trouble to adopt new terminology in an effort to emphasize that the quotas were not being taken away from Cuba on a permanent basis and that the countries to which the Cuban quota would be reassigned would not have a vested right to it in the future. Those efforts were appropriate and desirable. The fact remains, however, that when price premiums amount to as much as \$150 million a year, vested interests are claimed automatically. All the arguments in the book will be put forth by producers desiring to sell at such premium prices. Regardless of the wishes of either Congress or the administrative agencies the vested interest arguments of new suppliers will become stronger as the period of time they supply our market increases.

Economics has long been known as the dismal science. Any objective summary of the present Cuban sugar economy and its prospects is dismal indeed.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

<u>Date announced</u>	<u>Nature of action</u>
October 18, 1960	The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation State Committees of 3 states issued bases and procedures for establishing proportionate share areas and/or farm proportionate shares for the 1960 crop of sugar beets. This completes the publication of state bases and procedures. (See October 18, 1960 Federal Register).
November 1, 1960	Determination of fair and reasonable prices for 1960 Florida sugarcane crop. This continues for the 1960-crop the provisions of the 1959-crop determination. (See November 4, 1960 Federal Register).
November 21, 1960	Public hearing announced on fair and reasonable prices for 1961 crop Hawaiian sugarcane. The hearing will begin at 9:00 a.m., December 16, 1960 in the Auditorium of the Hilo Electric Light Company, Ltd., Hilo, Hawaii. (Scheduled for publication in November 26, 1960 Federal Register).
November 22, 1960	A series of public hearings announced on wage rates and prices for the 1961 crop of sugar beets. The series will be considered as one hearing and testimony at each place will constitute a part of the same record. Persons may present testimony at any of the designated places. The hearings will be

Date announcedNature of action

November 22,
1960 (cont'd)

held between December 5 and December 19, 1960 in the following cities: Detroit, Michigan at 10 a.m., December 5, 1960, in Court Room 859 Federal Building; Fargo, North Dakota at 10 a.m., December 7, 1960, in the Community Room, Northwestern Saving & Loan Association, 720 Main Street; Yakima, Washington at 10 a.m., December 10, 1960, in the Chinook Hotel; Greeley, Colorado at 10 a.m., December 13, 1960, in the Elks Club, 922-9th Street; Berkeley, California at 10 a.m., December 19, 1960, Room 215 Stead Building, 1960 Addison Street. (See November 23, 1960 Federal Register).

STATISTICAL SERIES IN THIS ISSUEHIGHLIGHTS

1. October 1960 sugar deliveries for continental U.S. consumption, 696,000 short tons, raw value (preliminary), down 142,000 tons from September 1960, and up 44,000 from October 1959. January-October 1960 deliveries 7,856,000 short tons, raw value (preliminary) up 128,000 tons or 1.7 percent from same 1959 period. Final data for September 1960 deliveries, 838,000 tons -- previously published preliminary as 834,000 tons.

2. Primary distributors' stocks October 29, 1960 were 1,300,000 short tons, raw value (preliminary), up 53,000 tons from a year earlier, and up 316,000 tons from end September 1960. During October stocks of beet processors increased by 428,000 tons; stocks of other primary distributors decreased -- refiners by 100,000 tons (to near the level of a year ago), importers of direct-consumption sugar by 12,000 tons, and mainland sugarcane processors by about 500 tons.

3. Charges to quotas through November 10, 1960 were 7,575,000 short tons, raw value. In addition, 1,200,000 tons of non-quota purchase sugar had been authorized for purchase of which about 968,000 tons had been authorized for entry.

4. Regionally, January-September 1960 total sugar deliveries as compared with the same 1959 period were up 1.2 percent with deliveries to the North Central and Southern regions up 3.5 and 2.2 percent, respectively, and other regions down 1.0 to 2.0 percent.

Table 1. - Sugar supply and disposition by primary distributors, January-September 1960

(Short tons, raw value)

Item	: Beet	: Importers	: Main-land cane	Refiners		: Net total
	: processors ^{1/}	: processors ^{2/}	: processors ^{2/}	: Raw	: Refined	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
SUPPLY						
1. <u>Inventory Jan. 1, 1960</u>	1,223,359	39,349	19,026	406,522	317,036	2,005,292
2. <u>Production and movement</u>						
a. Received as direct-consumption sugar	0	560,371	0	0	5,937	566,308
b. Produced from beets or cane	670,860	0	117,016	0	0)	
Less deliveries to refiners	0	0	113,757	0	0)	674,119 ^{3/}
c. Receipts of raws by refiners	0	0	0	5,006,245 ^{4/}	0)	
Less raws melted	0	0	0	5,024,050	0)	- 17,805 ^{5/}
d. Refined from raws melted	0	0	0	0	4,982,200	4,982,200
e. Adjustments	- 263	- 2,977	- 226	- 276	- 2,250	- 5,992
f. Sub-total	670,597	557,394	3,033	- 18,081	4,985,887	6,198,830
g. Net total supply	1,893,956	596,743	22,059	388,441	5,302,923	8,204,122
DISPOSITION						
3. <u>Distribution for</u>						
a. Quota purposes	1,668,553	476,667	21,517	2,895	4,990,771	7,160,403
b. Export	0	9,782	0	0	29,619	39,401
c. Livestock feed	323	18,874	0	0	683	19,880
d. Sub-total	1,668,876	505,323	21,517	2,895	5,021,073	7,219,684
4. <u>Inventory Sept. 30, 1960</u>	225,080	91,420	542	385,546 ^{6/}	281,850 ^{6/}	984,438
Total distribution and inventory	1,893,956	596,743	22,059	388,441	5,302,923	8,204,122

^{1/} Direct-consumption sugar only.^{2/} Processor-refiners are included with refiners.^{3/} Production less deliveries of raw sugar to refiners.^{4/} Includes 113,757 tons delivered from mainland cane processors.^{5/} Receipts plus production of raw sugar by refiners less melt.^{6/} Includes mainland cane sugar not yet charged to quota: Raws, 678; Refined 1,634; Total 2,312.

Table 2 .-Distribution of sugar by primary distributors for direct consumption, Puerto Rico and Hawaii during January-September 1960 and 1959

Item	1960	1959	Change 1959 to 1960
(Short tons, raw value)			
Continental United States			
Refiners' raw	2,895	1,992	+ 903
Refiners' refined	5,021,073	4,959,018	+ 62,055
Beet processors' refined	1,668,876	1,601,071	+ 67,805
Importers' direct consumption	505,323	572,213	- 66,890
Mainland sugarcane processors'	21,517	17,517	+ 4,000
Total	7,219,684	7,151,811	+ 67,873
For: Export	39,401	48,560	- 9,159
Livestock feed	19,880	27,774	- 7,894
Continental consumption 1/	7,160,403	7,075,477	+ 84,926
Puerto Rico	84,309	82,240	+ 2,069
Hawaii	35,439	34,467	+ 972

1/ Includes deliveries for United States Military forces at home and abroad.

Table 3 .-Stocks of sugar held by primary distributors in the continental United States, September 30, 1960 and 1959

Item	1960	1959	Change 1959 to 1960
(Short tons, raw value)			
Refiners: Raw 1/	385,546	392,407	- 6,861
Refined 1/	281,850	250,891	+ 30,959
Sub-total	667,396	643,298	+ 24,098
Beet processors, refined	225,080	221,484	+ 3,596
Importers, direct-consumption	91,420	88,302	+ 3,118
Mainland sugarcane processors 2/	542	695	- 153
Total	984,438	953,779	+ 30,659

1/ Includes mainland cane sugar not yet charged to quota: 1960 - Raws, 678; Refined, 1,634; Total, 2,312; 1959 - Raws, 4; Refined, 2,396; Total, 2,400.

2/ Establishments that acquire no raw sugar from others for refining. Processor-refiner stocks are included in refiners' stocks.

Table 4 .-Distribution of sugar by primary distributors for direct consumption, October and January-October, 1960 and 1959

Item	1960 1/	1959	Change 1959 to 1960
(Short tons, raw value)			
	October	January-October	October
Refiners	517,577	5,541,545	449,255
Beet processors	143,630	1,812,506	164,667
Importers	33,882	539,205	43,164
Mainland sugarcane processors	500 2/	22,017	1,668
Total	695,589	7,915,273	658,754
For: Export	N.A.	39,401 4/	3,814
Livestock feed	N.A.	19,880 4/	2,688
Continental consumption 3/	695,589	7,855,992	652,252

1/ Preliminary. 2/ Estimated. 3/ Includes deliveries for U. S. military forces at home and abroad.

4/ January-September only.

Table 5 .-Stocks of sugar held by primary distributors in the continental United States, October 29, 1960 and October 31, 1959

Item	1960 1/	1959	Change 1959 to 1960
(Short tons, raw value)			
Refiners' Raw	294,367	271,640	+ 22,727
Refined	273,244	302,978	- 29,734
Sub-total	567,611	574,618	- 7,007
Beet processors' refined	653,104	589,218	+ 63,886
Importers' direct-consumption	79,518	68,638	+ 10,880
Mainland sugarcane processors	0 2/	14,608	- 14,608
Total	1,300,233	1,247,082	+ 53,151

1/ Preliminary.

2/ Estimated.

Table 6 .-Mainland sugar: Production and quota charges January-September 1960 and 1959

Item	1960	1959	Change 1959 to 1960
(Short tons, raw value)			
<u>Production</u>			
Mainland cane	116,549	90,546	+ 26,003
Domestic beet	670,597	589,440	+ 81,157
Total	787,146	679,986	+ 107,160
<u>Quota charges</u>			
Mainland cane:			
Louisiana sugarcane processors			
For further processing	219	318	- 99
For direct-consumption	14,071	13,108	+ 963
Louisiana processor-refiners	38,103	31,163	+ 6,940
Florida sugarcane processors	120,199	92,256	+ 27,943
Sub-total	172,592	136,845	+ 35,747
Beet processors	1,668,553	1,599,825	+ 68,728
Total	1,841,145	1,736,670	+ 104,475

Table 7 .-Sugar receipts of refiners and importers by source of supply 1/ January-September 1960 and 1959

Source of Supply	Raw sugar	Direct-consumption		
	sugar	sugar		
	1960	1959	1960	1959
(Short tons, raw value)				
<u>Offshore</u>				
<u>Foreign</u>				
Cuba	1,942,352	2,495,236	324,490	402,978
Philippines	937,112	886,175	35,385	36,100
Other countries	641,860	169,295	84,214	71,250
Sub-total	3,521,324	3,550,706	444,089	510,328
<u>Domestic</u>				
Hawaii	675,278	737,348	5,937 2/	16,819 2/
Puerto Rico	685,718	642,295	116,282	118,898
Virgin Islands	6,954	12,302	0	0
Sub-total	1,367,950	1,391,945	122,219	135,717
Total offshore	4,889,274	4,942,651	566,308	646,045
Mainland cane area	113,757	88,849	0	0
Acquired for reprocessing and samples	3,214	2,735	0	0
Grand Total	5,006,245	5,034,235	566,308	646,045

1/ Includes quota exempt sugar as follows:

Purpose	Importers		Refiners		Total	
	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959
	(Short tons, raw value)					
Feed	29,435	27,522	1,238	884	30,673	28,406
Re-export	9,762	18,524	38,618	35,645	48,380	54,169
Over quota under Sugar Regulation 817.8(c)	0	0	691	0	691	0
Total	39,197	46,046	40,547	36,529	79,744	82,575

2/ Refined sugar received by refiners.

Table 8.-Status of 1960 Sugar Quotas as of November 10, 1960

Area	Quota	Credit for drawback of duty	Charge to quota & off- set to drawback of duty	Direct consump- tion 2/ Short tons, raw value	Unfilled balance	Direct consump- tion
Domestic beet	2,514,945		1,855,000		659,945	
Mainland cane	773,873		337,000		436,873	
Hawaii 3/	940,444		763,289	5,942	177,155	29,681
Puerto Rico 3/	893,620		880,319	138,253	13,301	13,301
Virgin Islands 3/	8,618		6,954		1,664	
Republic of the Philippines	980,000		980,000	42,311		
Cuba	2,419,655 4/	2,404	2,394,211 5/	312,742		
Other foreign countries	432,945	1,493	358,513	66,151	75,925	4,764
Total Quotas	8,964,100	3,897	7,575,286	565,399	1,364,863	47,746
Subject to Section 408 (b) of Act	1,435,900	(For status see Table 10.)				
Total Requirements	10,400,000					

Details of other foreign country quotas

Peru	138,827	1,166	82,446	10,852	57,547	579
Dominican Republic	130,957	307	129,355	8,281	1,909	1,909 6/
Mexico	115,809	15	101,182	18,015	14,642	496
Nicaragua	19,766	5	18,056	10,539	1,715	1,668
Haiti	9,105	0	9,010	0	95	95
Netherlands	4,427	0	4,427	4,427	0	0 6/
China	4,218	0	4,210	4,210	8	8
Panama	4,218	0	4,218	4,218	0	0
Costa Rica	4,202	0	4,195	4,195	7	7
Canada	631	0	631	631	0	0 6/
United Kingdom	516	0	516	516	0	0 6/
Belgium	182	0	181	181	1	1 6/
British Guiana	84	0	83	83	1	1
Hong Kong	3	0	3	3	0	0 6/
Total	432,945	1,493	358,513 7/	66,151	75,925	4,764

LIQUID SUGAR 8/

Wine gallons of 72 percent total sugar content

Cuba	7,176,648	7,176,648	0
Dominican Republic	830,894	734,680	396,214
British West Indies	300,000	0	300,000

- 1/ These data include the following: (a) Domestic beet and mainland cane sugar partly estimated; (b) all other sugar entered or authorized for entry as of November 10, 1960.
- 2/ Includes raw sugar for direct-consumption from Cuba 16,868; Philippines 5,848; Hawaii 10; Total 22,726.
- 3/ Despite deficits declared, full quotas remain available as follows: Hawaii 1,265,375; Puerto Rico 1,323,111; Virgin Islands 18,043.
- 4/ Including 39,752 tons for balance of 1960 after July 6 as established by Presidential Proclamation No. 3355.
- 5/ Difference from quota results from outturns to date smaller than quantities authorized prior to July 3.
- 6/ Sugar held in Customs custody pending availability of quota: Canada 1,282; Hong Kong 66; Netherlands 17,338; United Kingdom 1,644; Belgium 590. Held for quota-exempt purposes, 2,014 from Dominican Republic.
- 7/ Under Sec. 212 (1) charges to quotas exclude 5 tons from Sweden, 10 tons from Brazil, Ireland, West Germany and from each other country listed.
- 8/ Under Sec. 212 (3) 2,824 gallons were entered from France; 13,701 from the United Kingdom; and 360 from Australia.

Table 9.-Quota-exempt sugar entered under Sections 212 (4) and 211 (a) as of November 10, 1960

Table 7. - Quota-exempt sugar entered under Sections 212 (4) and 212 (5) as of November 30, 1955			
Source	:	For	:
	:	Feed	:
	:	Reexport	:
	:	Total	
		Short tons, raw value	
Brazil	0	1,135	1,135
Canada	7	0	7
Cuba	22,598	10,713	33,311
Dominican Republic	6,048	21,734	27,782
Mexico	2,217	10,964	13,181
Peru	571	4,898	5,469
Total	31,441	49,444	80,885

Table 10.-Status of Non-Quota Purchase Sugar as of November 10, 1960

Area	Authorized	Authorized for Entry For <u>1/</u>		Total Unfilled Balance
	for Purchase	Further Processing	Direct- Consumption	
Short tons, raw value				
Dominican Republic	321,857	155,606	0	166,251
Mexico	284,628	280,990	1,997	1,641
Philippines	176,426	176,433	0	0
Peru	135,000	106,994	0	28,006
Brazil	100,347	99,358	0	989
British W. Indies and British Guiana	92,765	81,017	0	11,748
Haiti	26,567	24,286	0	2,281
Nicaragua	22,000	9,264	2,000	10,736
Costa Rica	6,267	4,284	1,999	0
China (Formosa)	6,258	6,267	0	0
Panama	6,258	0	2,000	4,258
Netherlands	6,129	0	6,114	15
El Salvador	6,000	5,898	0	102
Guatemala	6,000	0	0	6,000
Canada	1,657	0	1,657	0
United Kingdom	1,355	0	1,351	4
Belgium	478	0	478	0
Hong Kong	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	1,200,000	950,397 <u>2/</u>	17,604 <u>2/</u>	232,031
Not authorized for purchase	235,900			
Total subject to Section 408 (b) of Act	1,435,900			

^{1/} Adjusted for available final outturn data which accounts for excess of 7 tons for the Philippines, 16 tons for Costa Rica, and 9 tons for China.

^{2/} Of the quantities shown, 898,695 tons for further processing and 17,604 tons for direct-consumption were authorized on or before October 31, 1960.

Table 11.-Charges to quotas and direct-consumption limits, including offsets to drawback of duty, January-October 1960 and 1959 ^{1/}

	Total		Direct-consumption	
	1960	1959	1960	1959
Short tons, raw value				
Domestic beet	1,812,000	1,764,467		
Mainland cane	255,000	212,596		
Hawaii	763,122	868,244	5,942	19,891
Puerto Rico	877,193	832,990	134,947	129,831
Virgin Islands	6,954	12,302		
Philippines	980,000	980,000	42,311	37,719
Cuba	2,394,211	3,090,432	312,742	375,705
Other foreign countries	340,553	248,217	65,131	62,460
Total	7,429,033	8,009,248	561,073	625,606
Details of other foreign countries				
Peru	64,770	78,507	10,274	9,054
Dominican Republic	128,980	80,562	7,906	8,984
Mexico	101,273	53,181	17,948	14,403
Nicaragua	18,056	12,887	10,539	10,469
Haiti	9,010	7,025	0	3,515
Netherlands	4,427	3,731	4,427	3,731
China	4,210	3,623	4,210	3,623
Panama	4,218	3,651	4,218	3,651
Costa Rica	4,195	3,616	4,195	3,616
Canada	631	631	631	631
United Kingdom	516	516	516	516
Belgium	181	180	181	180
British Guiana	83	84	83	84
Hong Kong	3	3	3	3
Total	340,553	248,217	65,131	62,460

	LIQUID SUGAR	
	1960	1959
	Wine gallons of 72 percent total sugar content	
Cuba	7,176,648	7,970,558
Dominican Republic	434,680	830,894
British West Indies	0	0

1/ These data include the following: (a) For domestic beet and mainland cane sugar partly estimated; (b) all other sugar entered or authorized for entry as of October 31.

2/ In addition, 691 tons were entered under bond for refining, to be charged to the 1961 quota.

Table 12.-Quota-exempt sugar entered or authorized for entry under Sections 212 (4) and 211 (a), January-October 1960 and 1959

Source	For				Total	
	Feed		Reexport			
	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959
Short tons, raw value						
Brazil	0	800	1,135	10,856	1,135	11,656
Canada	7	0	0	0	7	0
Costa Rica	0	496	0	0	0	496
Cuba	22,598	23,532	10,713	27,527	33,311	51,059
Dominican Republic	6,048	7,530	21,734	6,861	27,782	14,391
Mexico	2,094	2,676	11,318	3,700	13,412	6,376
Nicaragua	0	0	0	0	0	0
Panama	0	0	0	635	0	635
Peru	571	21	4,898	5,386	5,469	5,407
Total	31,318	35,055	49,798	54,965	81,116	90,020

Table 13.-Primary Distribution of Sugar, Continental United States by States, September 1960

State and region	Cane sugar refiners	Beet sugar processors	Importers of direct- consumption sugar	Mainland cane sugar mills	Total
Hundredweights ^{1/}					
New England					
Connecticut	117,972		4,188		122,160
Maine	62,670		240		62,910
Massachusetts	473,948		5,373		479,321
New Hampshire	28,890				28,890
Rhode Island	43,471		2,100		45,571
Vermont	22,786		6,000		28,786
Sub-total	749,737		17,901		767,638
Mid-Atlantic					
New Jersey	642,178		65,401		707,579
New York	1,361,089	1,659	133,107		1,495,855
Pennsylvania	960,137	8,650	185,167		1,153,954
Sub-total	2,963,404	10,309	383,675		3,357,388
North Central					
Illinois	710,821	832,035	8,200	11,635	1,562,691
Indiana	340,744	113,932	8,206		462,882
Iowa	40,593	117,638	350		158,581
Kansas	36,746	88,208			124,954
Michigan	276,349	301,803	7,200		585,352
Minnesota	23,309	132,376	350		156,035
Missouri	231,785	117,067		1,205	350,057
Nebraska	19,032	100,982			120,014
North Dakota	1,293	31,549			32,842
Ohio	779,704	123,107	15,291		918,102
South Dakota	1,866	46,708			48,574
Wisconsin	94,230	166,251	26,710		287,191
Sub-total	2,556,472	2,171,656	66,307	12,840	4,807,275
Southern					
Alabama	236,809				236,809
Arkansas	97,291				97,291
Delaware	21,476		820		22,296
District of Columbia	40,993		3,136		44,129
Florida	167,645		110,625	3,305	281,575
Georgia	336,680		17,898		354,578
Kentucky	188,338		26,759		215,097
Louisiana	319,005			1,659	320,664
Maryland	333,145		35,662		368,807
Mississippi	153,321				153,321
North Carolina	300,095		98,668		398,763
Oklahoma	104,369	17,373			121,742
South Carolina	146,914		10,335		157,249
Tennessee	269,756				269,756
Texas	590,949	92,102	5,204	1,032	689,287
Virginia	239,584		128,804		368,388
West Virginia	92,033		5,812		97,845
Sub-total	3,638,403	109,475	443,723	5,996	4,197,597
Western					
Alaska	2,505	929			3,434
Arizona	23,495	13,867			37,362
California	642,782	1,062,350	37,960		1,743,092
Colorado	5,426	90,002			95,428
Idaho	4,394	53,084			57,478
Montana	2,653	23,658			26,311
Nevada	6,218	3,868			10,086
New Mexico	11,497	15,103			26,600
Oregon	43,976	121,015	26,800		191,791
Utah	4,412	85,231			89,643
Washington	59,939	224,813	21,000		305,752
Wyoming	775	9,852			10,627
Sub-total	808,072	1,703,772	85,760		2,597,604
Grand total	10,716,088	3,995,212	997,366	18,836	15,727,502

^{1/} Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

Table 14. -Primary Distribution of Sugar, Continental United States by States, January-September 1960

State and region	Cane sugar refiners	Beet sugar processors	Importers of direct- consumption sugar	Mainland cane sugar mills	Total
Hundredweights ^{1/}					
New England					
Connecticut	988,186		47,718	1,140	1,037,044
Maine	543,612		7,030		550,642
Massachusetts	3,805,651		85,463	1,500	3,892,614
New Hampshire	282,353		900		283,253
Rhode Island	391,616		24,420		416,036
Vermont	172,723		66,001		238,724
Sub-total	6,184,141		231,532	2,640	6,418,313
Mid-Atlantic					
New Jersey	5,670,729		550,224	2,001	6,222,954
New York	11,613,890	117,980	1,311,632		13,043,502
Pennsylvania	7,783,321	117,411	1,665,601	28	9,566,361
Sub-total	25,067,940	235,391	3,527,457	2,029	28,832,817
North Central					
Illinois	6,079,216	6,360,535	45,505	164,350	12,649,606
Indiana	2,588,010	833,379	25,675	23	3,447,087
Iowa	455,325	1,228,667	6,728		1,690,720
Kansas	382,976	769,351		3	1,152,330
Michigan	2,491,738	2,051,059	172,154	1,000	4,715,951
Minnesota	315,955	1,636,536	1,661		1,954,152
Missouri	2,299,807	1,058,730		3,609	3,362,146
Nebraska	195,947	999,800		11	1,195,758
North Dakota	6,931	260,000			266,931
Ohio	6,076,154	842,247	92,043	5,806	7,016,250
South Dakota	23,299	373,089			396,388
Wisconsin	1,072,577	1,501,794	53,824		2,628,195
Sub-total	21,987,935	17,915,187	397,590	174,802	40,475,514
Southern					
Alabama	2,347,720			4,410	2,352,130
Arkansas	921,408	30,337			951,745
Delaware	175,003		11,460	1	186,464
District of Columbia	366,246		46,908		413,154
Florida	1,233,268	1	1,631,394	104,086	2,968,749
Georgia	3,905,747		391,306	20,243	4,317,296
Kentucky	1,911,599	7,540	85,916	6,054	2,011,109
Louisiana	2,805,246		1,188 2/	25,520	2,831,954 2/
Maryland	2,865,895	1	286,431		3,152,327
Mississippi	1,575,397			10,345	1,585,742
North Carolina	2,559,187		775,043		3,334,230
Oklahoma	986,294	225,306	2,827		1,214,427
South Carolina	1,355,290		99,155		1,454,445
Tennessee	2,755,388		33,900 2/	44,726	2,834,014 2/
Texas	5,358,158	1,001,665	74,713	8,887	6,443,423
Virginia	1,721,468		799,087	7	2,520,562
West Virginia	723,635	1,600	45,500		770,735
Sub-total	33,566,949	1,266,450	4,284,828	224,279	39,342,506
Western					
Alaska	23,832	12,785			36,617
Arizona	279,653	158,276			437,929
California	5,457,928	7,374,756	217,638	1,200	13,051,522
Colorado	64,851	806,447		684	871,992
Idaho	35,616	273,943			309,559
Montana	16,868	262,763		3	279,634
Nevada	54,142	31,926			86,068
New Mexico	104,254	149,925			254,179
Oregon	470,779	816,998	122,439		1,410,216
Utah	43,296	523,619			566,915
Washington	556,556	1,276,721	128,259		1,961,536
Wyoming	5,999	83,014			89,013
Sub-total	7,113,784	11,771,173	468,336	1,887	19,355,180
Grand total	93,920,749	31,188,201	8,909,743	405,637	134,424,330

^{1/} Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis. ^{2/} 16,737 hundredweights previously included as deliveries to Louisiana should have been included as deliveries to Tennessee. The January-September delivery data have been adjusted accordingly.

Table 15.-Primary Distribution of Sugar, Continental United States by States, January-September 1960 and 1959

State and Region	Cane sugar refiners		Beet processors		Total all Primary Distributors ^{2/}	
	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959
Thousands of hundredweights ^{1/}						
New England						
Connecticut	988	986			1,037	1,041
Maine	544	538			551	552
Massachusetts	3,806	3,894		*	3,893	3,999
New Hampshire	282	286			283	286
Rhode Island	391	398			416	418
Vermont	173	189			238	251
Sub-total	6,184	6,291		*	6,418	6,547
Mid-Atlantic						
New Jersey	5,671	5,762		*	6,223	6,348
New York	11,614	11,821	118	55	13,044	13,107
Pennsylvania	7,783	7,248	117	52	9,566	9,677
Sub-total	25,068	24,831	235	107	28,833	29,132
North Central						
Illinois	6,079	6,031	6,361	5,987	12,650	12,196
Indiana	2,588	2,373	833	609	3,447	2,995
Iowa	455	442	1,229	1,235	1,691	1,677
Kansas	383	533	769	694	1,152	1,228
Michigan	2,492	2,392	2,051	2,135	4,716	4,788
Minnesota	316	364	1,637	1,533	1,954	1,897
Missouri	2,300	2,186	1,059	945	3,362	3,162
Nebraska	196	231	1,000	860	1,196	1,104
North Dakota	7	8	260	302	267	313
Ohio	6,076	5,848	842	861	7,016	6,843
South Dakota	23	19	373	324	396	343
Wisconsin	1,073	1,027	1,501	1,484	2,628	2,553
Sub-total	21,988	21,454	17,915	16,959	40,475	39,099
Southern						
Alabama	2,348	2,418			2,352	2,426
Arkansas	922	849	30	40	952	889
Delaware	175	163			187	176
District of Columbia	366	395			413	455
Florida	1,233	1,165	*		2,969	2,929
Georgia	3,906	3,690	8	7	4,317	4,174
Kentucky	1,912	1,764			2,011	1,828
Louisiana	2,805	2,851			2,832	2,880
Maryland	2,866	2,703	*		3,152	3,096
Mississippi	1,575	1,658			1,586	1,663
North Carolina	2,559	2,547			3,334	3,181
Oklahoma	986	949	225	205	1,215	1,154
South Carolina	1,355	1,432			1,454	1,544
Tennessee	2,755	2,622			2,834	2,675
Texas	5,358	5,224	1,002	935	6,443	6,244
Virginia	1,722	1,675	2	8	2,521	2,374
West Virginia	724	759		1	771	804
Sub-total	33,567	32,864	1,267	1,196	39,343	38,492
Western						
Alaska	24	31	13	23	37	54
Arizona	280	280	158	159	438	441
California	5,458	5,604	7,375	7,096	13,051	13,073
Colorado	65	56	806	783	872	841
Idaho	36	36	274	266	310	302
Montana	17	15	263	271	280	286
Nevada	54	58	32	32	86	90
New Mexico	104	103	150	172	254	283
Oregon	471	524	817	907	1,410	1,529
Utah	43	47	524	514	567	568
Washington	556	533	1,276	1,359	1,961	1,966
Wyoming	6	5	83	90	89	95
Sub-total	7,111	7,292	11,771	11,672	19,355	19,528
Grand total	93,921	92,732	31,188	29,934	134,424	132,798

^{1/} Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

^{2/} Includes deliveries by importers of direct-consumption sugar and mainland cane sugar mills.

* Less than 500 cwt.

Table 16.-Sugar prices

Year and Month	Raw cane				
	For New York delivery				
	Spot price	1/ Freight and	insurance	F.A.S. Cuba	F.A.S. Cuba
	#6				Differential
Cents per pound					
1955-59 monthly av.	5.66	0.43	5.23	3.67	+1.56
1958 monthly av.	5.77	0.36	5.41	3.50	+1.91
1959 monthly av.	5.74	0.39	5.35	2.97	+2.38
1959					
November	5.94	0.41	5.53	2.96	+2.57
December	5.67	0.44	5.23	3.00	+2.23
1960					
January	5.39	0.44	4.95	2.97	+1.98
February	5.50	0.44	5.06	3.02	+2.04
March	5.61	0.47	5.14	3.05	+2.09
April	5.67	0.47	5.20	3.04	+2.16
May	5.59	0.45	5.14	3.05	+2.09
June	5.75	0.44	5.31	2.97	+2.34
July	5.98	0.44	5.54	3.26	+2.28
August	5.97	0.44	5.53	3.31	+2.22
September	6.09	0.44	5.65	3.25	+2.40
October	6.02	0.44	5.58	3.25	+2.33
Last 12-month av.	5.77	0.44	5.32	3.09	+2.23

Year and Month	Refined, quoted wholesale (gross) 2/								
	Cane								
	Beet								
	N.Y.	S.E.	Gulf	Chi- West	Pacific: Coast	Chi- Eastern	Pacific: West	U. S. Coast	U. S. average
Cents per pound									
1955-59 monthly av.	9.02	8.89	8.88	8.73	8.94	8.57	8.53	8.87	10.94
1958 monthly av.	9.27	9.13	9.08	8.89	9.21	8.61	8.68	9.13	11.26
1959 monthly av.	9.33	9.19	9.28	8.88	9.10	8.71	8.67	9.10	11.43
1959									
November	9.55	9.40	9.50	9.00	9.10	8.80	8.80	9.10	11.54
December	9.48	9.33	9.43	8.88	9.07	8.68	8.68	9.07	11.58
1960									
January	9.35	9.20	9.30	8.80	8.90	8.60	8.60	8.90	11.56
February	9.35	9.20	9.30	8.80	8.90	8.60	8.60	8.90	11.46
March	9.23	9.25	9.30	8.80	8.90	8.60	8.60	8.90	11.50
April	9.20	9.30	9.30	8.80	8.90	8.60	8.60	8.90	11.48
May	9.20	9.30	9.30	8.80	8.90	8.60	8.60	8.90	11.46
June	9.20	9.30	9.30	8.80	8.90	8.60	8.60	8.90	11.44
July	9.47	9.42	9.40	9.11	8.94	8.98	8.91	8.94	11.48
August	9.70	9.60	9.50	9.35	9.15	9.35	9.15	9.15	11.72
September	9.70	9.60	9.50	9.15	9.15	9.16	8.95	9.15	11.84
October	9.70	9.60	9.50	9.15	8.95	9.05	8.95	8.95	
Last 12-month av.	9.43	9.38	9.39	8.95	8.98	8.80	8.75	8.98	11.55 3/

1/ Sugar in bags, cost insurance and freight paid to New York. For a duty-paid price add 0.50 cent.

2/ These are basis prices in 100 pound paper bags, NOT delivered prices. To obtain delivered prices add "freight prepay" and deduct discounts and allowances, if any. For illustration see Sugar Reports 81, January 1959, pages 5 to 9. 3/ 11-month average.

Table 17.-Refined sugar production and month-end stocks

Year and month	Production		Month-end stocks 1/	
	Cane sugar	Beet	Cane sugar	Beet
	refiners	processors	refiners	processors
	1,000 short tons, raw value			
1955-59 monthly av.	517	171	281	827
1958 monthly av.	517	187	267	835
1959 monthly av.	529	186	317	823
1959				
November	443	597	322	1,031
December	473	515	317	1,223
1960				
January	439	237	330	1,378
February	463	51	336	1,317
March	573	24	363	1,174
April	495	47	370	1,064
May	542	47	373	918
June	639	45	325	747
July	626	30	246	483
August	635	62	281	311
September	573	128	282	225
October 2/	509	572	273	653
Last 12-month av.	534	196	318	877

1/ Includes over-quota and quota exempt sugar. 2/ Preliminary.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Commodity Stabilization Service
Sugar Division
Washington 25, D. C.

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FIRST CLASS